

From: Jen Huebert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/19/01 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express my support for Steve Satchell to be a nominee for the three-member committee stationed at Microsoft for the Microsoft Anti-Trust Compliance Committee. I believe Mr. Satchell is well qualified for this position, and would be a fair and knowledgeable member of the committee.

I would like to comment on the case for public record according to my rights under the Tunney Act:

One of Microsoft's chief claims during this trial was that times and the nature of business have changed, and that anti-trust enforcement ought to be different today than it was when the laws were first passed over a century ago. Microsoft now appears to be leaning on this to disenfranchise many of the people and organizations who feel they have been damaged by Microsoft's actions.

Here's the explanation:

The remedies in the Proposed Final Judgement specifically protect companies in commerce -- organizations in business for profit. On the surface, that makes sense because Microsoft was found guilty of monopolistic activities against "competing" commercial software vendors like Netscape, and other commercial vendors.

Microsoft's greatest single threat on the operating system front comes from Linux -- a non-commercial product -- and it faces a growing threat on the applications front from Open Source and freeware applications. The biggest competitor to Microsoft Internet Information Server is Apache, which comes from the Apache Foundation, a not-for-profit. Apache practically rules the Net, along with Sendmail, and Perl, both of which also come from non-profits. Yet not-for-profit organizations have no rights at all under the proposed settlement. It is as though they don't even exist. Section III(J)(2) is a prime example, and Section III(D) is another. Under this deal, the government is shut out, too.

This is all cause of great concern, and should be to us all.

Regards,
Jen Huebert
jhuebert@postmark.net